

HPNS Technical Team Meeting Agenda
February 20, 2018, 1000-1100 PT

1. Welcome and check-in

Navy BRAC – Steve Banister, ~~Pat Brooks~~, Danielle Janda, Derek Robinson, Thomas Macchiarella

Navy BRAC Consultants – Craig Bias, Scott Hay, Kim Henderson, ~~Kathy Higley, Kira Sykes~~

RASO – Zach Edwards, Matt Slack

EPA and consultants – Karla Brasaemle, ~~John Chesnutt~~, Jana Dawson, Brianna Fairbanks, Donna Getty, David Kappelman, Lily Lee, ~~Lyndsey Nguyen~~

DTSC – Nina Bacey, ~~Janet Naito~~

CDPH – Tracy Jue, Sheetal Singh, Matt Wright

City (includes OCII/SFDPH and consultants) – Amy Brownell, Bob Burns, Christina Rain

Water Board – ~~Tina Low~~, David Tanouye

2. Gain feedback on draft work plan for soil and buildings

- Draft submitted 2/9/18
- Managers meeting 2/16/18
 - i. Nina indicated that based on the meeting, her understanding was that the work plan should not yet be reviewed as it will be revised based on the regulatory agency's proposal. Thomas requested that the agencies keep reviewing the work plan and that the plan is for the Navy to get back to the agencies on whether written comments are requested on the current version of the work plan.
 - ii. Lily provided a summary of the regulatory agency's feedback on the draft work plan during the meeting as follows:
 - 1. The agencies appreciated including:
 - a. Full excavation as part of group 2A.
 - b. Flexibility to work with agencies for determining survey units.
 - 2. The agency's concerns include:
 - a. Providing statistical confidence parcel-wide to show that the parcels are acceptable for future reuse.
 - b. Group 2b includes cores without surface scanning. Because there is a concern with future residential exposure, surface scanning is valuable both above and below the durable cover. Amy clarified with Lily that asphalt and other surfaces will need to be pulled up for the surface scan.
 - c. Allowance for an increase in survey unit size to be determined in TSPs. Lily's calculations indicate an average of 1.4 cores per trench unit, which is too little.

- d. Groups 1 and 2 still refer to the HRA areas and there should be other factors for establishing priorities for resampling (e.g., where there is an indication of falsification because they could have been covering up an area with potential contamination, lesser concerns about peanut spill based on previous actions).
 - e. There is a fundamental difference in perspective on revisiting ROD requirements where there has been widespread falsification, potentially indicating contamination.
 - iii. Nina stated that during the meeting, the agencies indicated that the Navy is spending too much time and energy on trying to confirm that the radiological remediation was completed rather than focusing on redoing the work and recommended that the Navy refocus their efforts. Danielle indicated that the terminology for confirming previous work was removed from the work plan and that confirmation is not the Navy's objective in the work plan. She asked whether there are specific areas in the work plan that indicate confirmation as an objective. Danielle expressed frustration that the term "confirmation" is still being used to describe the Navy's work plan approach. Nina indicated that it is just a difference in wording and the Navy's proposal is a reduced level of effort compared to what the agencies think is needed.
 - iv. Lily indicated EPA plans to provide a write-up regarding the percent confidence. EPA is looking for 95% confidence that all (or 95% of) survey units are acceptable. EPA is treating trench units individually using the VSP model that the Navy proposed in November 2017. EPA is also still discussing the NORM and background proposals.
 - v. Lily summarized the options that the regulatory agencies discussed with the Navy. Based on the original ROD requirements, 100% excavation and scanning is proposed; however, based on the alternate CSM, 100% can be conducted at a subset. If a certain % shows up clean, this provides some level of confidence that most of the rest is clean and a lower level of effort (e.g., not requiring full excavation but with surface scanning) for the remaining units can be considered. The Navy will need to provide a degree of confidence for Parcel G. If there are failures, the original ROD will need to be followed with full surface scans of all survey units. Additionally, the agencies do not agree with increases in survey unit size and other factors (e.g., more than the HRA) will need to be considered in choosing survey unit areas.
 - Jana asked whether the work plan was planned based on a phased approach as previously presented. Danielle indicated that the Navy has moved beyond that approach and are looking at the entire site.
- 3. Discuss plan to finalize soil reports
 - Parcels B and G soil report – 9/29/17
 - i. Parcel G RTCs to Technical Team – 12/6/17

1. DTSC additional comments received 1/23/18 – pending SFDPH, EPA, and CDPH review
 - ii. RTCs with Navy for review along with the Parcel B RTCs. The plan is to turn this around to the Technical Team next week when Pat returns.
 - iii. Lily indicated that they are holding back on comments based on the concern that the regulatory agency's recommendations need to be featured more prominently in the reports rather than in an appendix. Pat indicated that the legal and Navy and EPA managers may need to discuss.
 - iv. ORAU's assessment was sent to the Technical Team last week and they will be reviewing the work plan, comments are expected this Friday, 2/23, and they are reviewing the rest of the soil reports. Sheetal asked if the reports will be revised to address ORAU comments. Danielle indicated that they will be considered and addressed similarly to all other comments.
- Parcels D-2, UC-1, UC-2, and UC-3 soil report – 10/31/17
 - i. Comments pending from EPA - **expected this week**
- Parcel C soil report – 11/17/17
 - i. Comments pending from SFDPH, EPA, and CDPH
- Parcel E soil report – 12/29/17
 - i. Comments pending from all – **DTSC expects to have comments submitted 3/16**
- **Lily indicated that they have been asked to prioritize reviews on the path forward and facilitating the transfer of Parcel G rather than soil reports but to expect comments in the next couple of weeks.**
4. Schedule for building data evaluation report – **summarizes methodology tested to assess the allegations and presents duplicated data findings.**
 - Pre-draft to Navy by 2/23/18
 - Draft to Technical Team by 3/9/18
5. Schedule and topics for future calls/meetings
 - 3/6/18, 1000-1100 PT status call
 - i. Responses to comments on reports/work plan
 - ii. Plan for TSPs
 - 3/20/18, 1000-1100 PT status call
 - 4/3/18, 1000-1100 PT status call – cancel or reschedule? – **several folks will be out based on Spring Break and path forward will be determined when we get closer to the date.**
 - 4/17/18, 1000-1100 PT status call